





illustrated in Figure 6. Thus, Saliba does not teach or suggest a coaxial arrangement. The engagement of teeth in a coaxial arrangement has different considerations than that of a non-coaxial arrangement and one of ordinary skill in the art is not taught or motivated to use Saliba's teeth in a coaxial arrangement of a break and reel teeth.

Further, regarding claims 1 and 2, both claims recite "a tip part ... a taper portion ... and vertical portions extending in a substantially vertical manner from the terminal of the taper portion to the base portion." Thus, the substantially vertical portions extend from the taper portion to the base.

In contrast, the vertical portions of Saliba's teeth do not extend to the base. The vertical portions of Saliba's teeth extend from the tapered portion to the tip and the tapered portion extends to the base. Figures 5 and 9 illustrate Saliba's teeth and both show the tapered portion extending to the base and vertical portion extending up from the tapered portion. Further, Saliba discloses that:

the profile 61 of the tooth 60 of the reel 18 and the complementary profile 63 of the tooth 60 of the brake 70 are shaped so that the braking force acts on the root 64 of the tooth 60 ... Because the root 64 of the tooth 60 of the reel 18 widens at the base, the force is distributed over a large cross-sectional area relative to a tooth that does not widen. ... A modified tooth, such as may be useful in the systems and methods described herein, is depicted in FIG. 9. This tooth widens at the base.

Saliba, column 6, lines 12-21 and 46-48. Thus, Saliba does not teach or suggest all the elements of claims 1 and 2. Claims 6-8 and 12-14 depend from claims 1 and 2 respectively and recite over the prior art of record based at least on their dependency to the independent claim. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

